



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In asserting that an act is bound to take place, it is assumed theoretically that all the determining factors¹² are taken into consideration. As a matter of fact, of course, one does not do this. It is an easy step from the expression of a determined futurity in which it is assumed that all the determining factors are taken into account to one in which the assumption is given up and the implication is that the predication is based on a consideration of *some* determining factors, others being left out of consideration. I propose the name Contingent Determined Futurity for this modal meaning.

There is no evidence that the Greek subjunctive acquired this meaning; but in a few cases it is possible to see a tendency in that direction. So LLM. (= Lang, Leaf, and Myers) translate Il. 24.655 with "would"; Palmer so translates the subjunctive in Il. 4.388. The negative and subjunctive in Il. 2.488 are translated by Lang, Leaf, and Myers with "could" not, and Butcher and Lang so translate the subjunctive and negative of Od. 4.240, 11.517. But the 'could' meaning has the same relation to the 'would' meaning as the 'can' meaning has to the 'shall'. I do not defend these translations, but mention them as indicating how easy the transition to the meaning of contingent determined futurity is. One may be allowed to guess that the only thing which kept the subjunctive in Greek from acquiring this meaning was the competition of the optative¹³.

(To be concluded)

SALT LAKE CITY.

FRANK H. FOWLER.

REVIEWS

A Handbook of Greek Sculpture. By Ernest Arthur Gardner. London: Macmillan and Co. (1915). Pp. 605. 10 sh.

Of Professor Gardner's well-known Handbook of Greek Sculpture a new edition is more than welcome to students of Greek art. The book originally appeared in two parts, in 1896-1897. Since that time both parts have been reprinted repeatedly, with corrections. In 1905 a revised edition was brought out and new material was added in an Appendix. This was reprinted in 1907, 1909 and 1911. In this way the book has in a measure kept pace with the new discoveries in its field. The edition now before us does not represent a rewriting, but rather the original treatise with additions. The matter which had been included in the Appendix has now been incorporated in the text and new items and new illustrations have been added. The extent of these additions may be seen from the increase in the number of pages. Thus the edition of 1896-1897 had 552 pages; that of 1911 had 591; the edition of 1915 has 605. The sculptures of Delphi are now discussed in their proper places, as are the Hermes Propylaeus of

Alcamenes, the statue of Agias, the bronze athlete from Anticythera, etc. New material includes an account of the archaic pediment group at Corcyra, but without an illustration; of the colossal Apollo of Sunium; of the youthful Apollo from the Tiber, now in the Museo delle Terme, which the author is inclined to accept as a work of Phidias; of the Athena in Frankfurt belonging to Myron's famous group; of the archaic bronze Poseidon found in the sea near Thisbe; and illustrations of Furtwängler's restoration of the Aegina pediment groups, and a restoration of the group by Damophon at Lycosura.

The general characteristics of Professor Gardner's book are so well known that it is hardly necessary to discuss his theories in detail. At the same time it will, perhaps, not be out of place to recall some of them. In the early period he is much more ready than most students of sculpture to see Egyptian influence in the beginnings of Greek art. Thus, in the case of the Nicandra statue (page 126) he finds that the treatment of the hair "can only be derived from an Egyptian model"; and again (148), in discussing a statue at Candia he says, "There is almost certainly here a convention from the Egyptian wig". Also on page 165 he says of the statues of Dermys and Citylus,

in the position of the two, each with his arm about the other's neck, and in the treatment of the hair we can see clear indication of Egyptian models. The same wig-like treatment of the hair appears also on a head and shoulders of an early figure from the Ptoan sanctuary.

At the same time he believes that Assyrian art had considerable influence on early Greek sculpture. Most archaeologists will, however, want more substantial evidence than is here presented before they are ready to believe that Greek art in its beginnings was very deeply indebted either to Egypt or to Assyria.

The sculptures of the temple of Zeus at Olympia, Professor Gardner believes, were the work of local artists, but may have been designed by Paeonius and Alcamenes. To that extent he thinks the statement of Pausanias may be right, although the improbabilities are great.

He rejects the Apollo of the Omphalos as a work of Calamis, and argues that to obtain an appreciation of his style we must look to a development from the female figures of the Acropolis. He finds this in the bronze charioteer from Delphi, which he thinks may be a genuine work of this master.

Lysippos, he holds, is to be judged by the Agias, which was a genuine work superior to the Apoxyomenos, which was the product of his school.

The importance of Scopas and his influence upon his contemporaries and later artists is rightly emphasized; but Professor Gardner believes that the female figure found by Mendel at Tegea in 1901 was the *Atalanta* of the pediment and that it affords a criterion by which to judge Scopas's female heads.

The so-called Eubuleus he thinks does not go back to Praxiteles, but is a Hellenistic work, and its identifica-

¹²Apparently the original force of $\delta\upsilon$ and $\kappa\epsilon$ was 'under the circumstances'.

¹³Concerning the disappearance of the subjunctive of determined futurity in post-Homeric Greek see Gildersleeve, A. J. P. 29.267: "I should say that the real competitor of the 'futural' subjunctive is the optative with $\delta\upsilon$"

tion as Eubuleus he regards as impossible. The Mantinean reliefs "may be attributed, at least in design, to Praxiteles himself, though the execution was probably left to assistants".

The fine bronze athlete from Anticythera he regards as a Hellenistic work, and not as a product of the fourth century, and he, therefore, rejects the suggestion of Loeschke and others that it represents the Perseus of Euphranor.

These examples are sufficient to show his views on some of the problems in the history of Greek sculpture where opinions differ.

Perhaps it may sound like a paradox to say that Professor Gardner's book is so good that one cannot help wishing that it were better; but he had a great opportunity to produce a work that was really up to date in all respects and that he has not done. I do not mean by this that there are many mistakes in his book. The actual mistakes are very few; but there are omissions where one would look for information. For example, on pages 479 ff. he discusses the work of Boethus and merely mentions, without describing, the signed herm from Mahdia. An illustration of this herm should at least have been included; and other sculptures from this find in the sea should have been discussed. In his account of the Niobe group (459 ff.) he says nothing of any fifth century Niobids (see Furtwängler in *Sitzb. Mun. Akad.*, 1907, 207 ff.; also articles by Sauer and della Seta). Again, nothing is said of the Aphrodite of Cyrene; or of the Ludovisi throne and its remarkable counterpart in Boston, for, even if Professor Gardner is not convinced that his former strictures on the last named work are undeserved, he should at any rate have mentioned its existence. Other treasures of Greek art in this country, such as the beautiful head from Chios, now in Boston, are passed over in silence. A few things need revision, such as the statement that the Victory of Samothrace "carries a cross-tree, the framework of a trophy". Svoronos has shown sufficiently that she carries a standard, which took the place of a modern flag.

Misprints appear to be very rare. The illustrations themselves are not of uniform excellence. Some are very good, while others, such as those on pages 115, 141, 416, 497, and 501, are decidedly poor. Many could be added to advantage, especially in the sections dealing with the early development of sculpture. In the matter of spelling Greek proper names it is a relief to find "Mycenae", "Polycritus", and the like, instead of the German-Greek forms affected by many writers.

It is needless to comment further. The book is one which all students of ancient art will be glad to see. It will undoubtedly be much used.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

WILLIAM N. BATES.

A History of Sculpture. By Harold North Fowler. New York: The Macmillan Company (1916). Pp. xxvi + 445. \$2.00.

In writing this brief History of Sculpture, Professor Fowler has justly earned the thanks of those who have

long deplored the lack of a book that should be at once scholarly and appreciative, discriminating and comprehensive. There is no lack of literature on special sculptors and periods, but until now no attempt has been made to treat the entire subject of ancient and modern sculpture within the limits of a handbook. The difficulties inherent in the task are readily apparent: that they have been met with signal success will be evident to all who examine the book with care.

The author has aimed to give a history of sculpture "intended for the use of the general public and of young students, not a work of research for the enlightenment of scholars". In a work of this scope we may reasonably expect a sense of proportion, exact scholarship, and good style. Professor Fowler has so fully met these requirements that his book is sure of a long term of usefulness. In general no exception can be taken to the space devoted to the various periods. Greek sculpture, for example, takes up 76 of the 418 pages devoted to the history proper, the Renaissance in Italy, 44, and Egyptian sculpture, 23 pages. One might wish, however, that the 9 pages devoted to the relatively unimportant Etruscan sculpture had been given instead to the sculpture of the Far East (12 pages), which, as the author fully recognizes, is inadequately treated. While it is perfectly true that Chinese and Japanese sculpture "has not affected the development of our own art", still its scant consideration in a general history of sculpture is to be regretted, not only because the sculpture of the Far East is significant and beautiful in itself, but also because information regarding it is comparatively inaccessible to the general reader. The Irish and Scandinavian influence upon medieval sculpture in England, in the opinion of the reviewer, merits more than the passing allusion on page 227. And Troubetzkoy, one feels, has been rather summarily dispatched in the three compact sentences which close the all too brief account of the Russians. It is a question, too, whether such lists of names as occur on pages 212, 356, 361, 362, 375, and 376, serve a useful purpose. The author's aim, an entirely laudable one, to compress much information into the space at his disposal, leads in some instances, particularly in some of the later chapters, to a manner of enumeration which is not always happy. In fairness to Professor Fowler it should be said, however, that, in a field where the material is overwhelming and eclecticism imperative, his taste is just and sure.

The book has the supreme merit of scholarly accuracy—a rather rare thing in a field where the desire to provide 'atmosphere' often results in a flagrant neglect of the 'dry light' proverbially, but incorrectly, ascribed to Herakleitos. Minor misprints may be found, especially in the spelling of some names and in the Index, but it is not necessary to catalogue them here. The statement (38) that "few artists of any age have succeeded better than those who carved these <Assyrian> reliefs in reproducing the characteristic motions of different animals", is, perhaps, excessive praise. 'Aegean' is certainly preferable to "Cretan" or "Minoan"